



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/818,884	03/17/1997	SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI	0756-1653	1108

31780 7590 09/10/2002

ERIC ROBINSON
PMB 955
21010 SOUTHBANK ST.
POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/818,884

Applicant(s)

Yamazaki et al.

Examiner

Dung Nguyen

Art Unit

2871



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 17, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 17-24, 26, 27, 30-33, and 36-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 17-24, 26, 27, 30-33, and 36-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 57, 61 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2871

Response to Arguments

Applicant's response dated 05/17/2002 has been received and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 7, 9-10, 17-19, 27, 30, 51-52 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takemura, US Patent No. 5,581,092 as stated in the previous action.

Applicants, again, contend that Takemura fails to teach a semiconductor integrated circuit (IC) chip since Takemura discloses a thin film semiconductor IC, while the present invention includes at least one semiconductor IC chip and these chips are not constituted by TFTs (Amendment, page 5). The Examiner, again, respectfully disagrees with the applicant's viewpoint. In particular, according to Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Fifth Edition, McGraw-Hill, 1994, the term "integrated circuit" denotes for "an interconnected array of active and passive elements integrated with a single semiconductor substrate or deposited on the substrate ...capable of performing at least one complete electronic circuit function". In other words, the Applicants' IC chip and the patent IC would be the same as well.

It should be noted that of the filing date of the US Patent No. 5,581,092 (09/06/1994) is after the foreign priority date of the instant application. If Applicants wish to overcome such

Art Unit: 2871

prior art, then sworn translation of the foreign priority documents will need to be filed with the response to this Office Action.

Double Patenting

3. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-10, 17-24, 26, 27, 30-33 and 36-55 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3, 13 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,291 as stated in the previous office action.

Regarding the above claims, as asserted by Applicants, the '291 patent merely recites a semiconductor chip, it should be noted that semiconductor chip is also known as IC chip. Therefore, the semiconductor chip and/or IC chip are/is the same one.

Accordingly, the double patenting rejection stands.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 05/17/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as noted above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 2871

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0423. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7726.

Any information of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

DN
09/05/2002


William L. Sikes
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 2871